



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

66  
UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

| APPLICATION NO.  | FILING DATE | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR         | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. | CONFIRMATION NO.   |
|--|-------------|------------------------------|---------------------|--------------------|
| 10/616,852   | 07/09/2003  | Malcolm Reginald Hallis Bell | 1193-4049           | 1841               |
| 27123  | 7590        | 08/16/2007                   | EXAMINER            |                    |
| MORGAN & FINNEGAN, L.L.P.<br>3 WORLD FINANCIAL CENTER<br>NEW YORK, NY 10281-2101 |             |                              |                     | SHAPIRO, JEFFERY A |
| ART UNIT   |             | PAPER NUMBER                 |                     |                    |
|  |             | 3653                         |                     |                    |
| MAIL DATE  |             | DELIVERY MODE                |                     |                    |
|  |             | 08/16/2007                   |                     |                    |
|  |             | PAPER                        |                     |                    |

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

|                              |                    |              |
|------------------------------|--------------------|--------------|
| <b>Office Action Summary</b> | Application No.    | Applicant(s) |
|                              | 10/616,852         | BELL ET AL.  |
|                              | Examiner           | Art Unit     |
|                              | Jeffrey A. Shapiro | 3653         |

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --  
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

#### Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 07 June 2007.
- 2a) This action is FINAL.                            2b) This action is non-final.
- 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

#### Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 1-32 is/are pending in the application.
  - 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) Claim(s) 1-32 is/are rejected.
- 7) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

#### Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
 

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

#### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
  - a) All    b) Some \* c) None of:
    1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
    2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
    3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

#### Attachment(s)

- 1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date \_\_\_\_\_
- 4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date \_\_\_\_\_
- 5) Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) Other: \_\_\_\_\_

## DETAILED ACTION

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

2. Claims 1-32 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Molbak (US 6,494,776 B1) in view of Dobbins et al (US 5,730,272) and further in view of Stieber et al (US 2002/010066A1).

Molbak discloses, as described in **Claims 1, 8, 14, 20, 21 and 27**, several automatic coin counting devices (100), each with a coin acceptor (1872), said coin acceptor connected with and communicating over a network through network interface/communication means (1826, 1828). See also col. 4, line 59-col. 5, line 5 and col. 11, line 66-col. 12, line 61. See also figures 2, 18a and 18b.

As described in **Claims 1, 8, 14, 20, 21 and 27**, Molback does not expressly disclose, but Stieber discloses a modular network of multiple cash handling devices coupled with each other, in which each component cash handler communicates with a central controller as well as other cash handling machines. See Stieber, figure 1 and paragraphs 8, 10, 15, 16 and 19-27. Regarding 1<sup>st</sup>, 2<sup>nd</sup> and 3<sup>rd</sup> acceptors in communication with each other, note paragraph 26, which discusses connection of up to eight cash acceptors in a bluetooth-based piconet. Paragraph 16, lines 10-14, mentions that wireless protocols other than bluetooth, such as infrared IrDa, Home RF,

Art Unit: 3653

and SWAP (shared wireless access protocol) may be used. Note also that paragraph 15 discloses that both cash machines (12 and 13) both have transceivers, which are used for both transmission of as well as receiving data.

At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to incorporate a modular networked system in Molbak's currency discrimination system, as taught by Steiber, for the purpose of increasing flexibility by increasing the range of cash handling tasks available to the system. See Steiber, paragraph 6.

Molbak does not expressly disclose, but Dobbins discloses a currency acceptor (10) having a sensing means (see Dobbins, elements 21, 22, 24 and 25 and col. 6, lines 60-66), processing means (35), said processing means sending an alarm upon detection of a fraud attempt, said alarm causing said processor to modify its acceptance criteria. See Dobbins, col. 2, lines 14-18 and col. 7, lines 1-59, noting in particular col. 7, lines 44-60.

Dobbins also discloses, as described in **Claims 2-6, 9-13, 15-19, 22-26 and 28-32**, said condition comprises at least one of the sensed parameters since inductive sensor (26) senses coin parameters including diameter and material. Additionally, as described, for example, in col. 2, lines 15-17 and col. 7, lines 12-30, the window of an acceptance region of genuine coins is made smaller so as to segregate and therefore increase the rejection of fraudulent coins.

At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to replace Molbak's currency discrimination system with that of Dobbins' discrimination system and method of rejecting non-genuine coins upon detection of a fraud attempt, causing the

acceptance criteria/acceptance window to be changed so as to screen out said non-genuine coins. See Dobbins, cited above. Note that it would have also been obvious to communicate said information over Molbak's communication means since Molbak's system discloses such communication between the coin acceptor and the central computer facility. See Molbak Claim 1, for example.

The suggestion/motivation would have been to improve acceptance and rejection of coins, including an improved rate of rejection by modifying the acceptance criteria. See Dobbins, col. 2, lines 8-15. Note also that Molbak describes providing modem communications for uploading or downloading data in col. 12, lines 11-21, of which acceptance alarms and currency discriminator acceptance criteria is considered to be such data which can be easily communicated through a modem connection to a central computer. It also would have been obvious to have one acceptor alert Molbak's other acceptors to an attempt of fraud in one acceptor, thereby causing other acceptors to narrow their acceptance windows, as taught by Dobbins.

#### ***Response to Arguments***

3. Applicant's arguments filed 6/7/07 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. In response to Applicant's amendments and arguments, Stieber has been added to the rejection, as discussed above. Steiber clearly discloses networked cash handling devices communicating both with a central controller as well as each other. Again, see Stieber at paragraph 8. Molbak, as the primary reference, provides the basic disclosure that teaches several automatic coin counting devices (100), each with a coin acceptor (1872), said coin acceptor connected with and communicating over a

network through network interface/communication means (1826, 1828), as discussed above. Dobbins discloses a currency acceptor (10) having a sensing means (see Dobbins, elements 21, 22, 24 and 25 and col. 6, lines 60-66), processing means (35), said processing means sending an alarm upon detection of a fraud attempt, said alarm causing said processor to modify its acceptance criteria.

Steiber's teaching further buttresses the combination of Molbak and Dobbins by providing the teaching of a network of currency acceptors which communicate back and forth between each other. Applicants asset that Steiber only teaches one-way communication by other cash acceptors with the base device. However, Steiber teaches that each cash acceptor (12 and 13) as well as the peripheral devices have a transceiver (24), as illustrated in figures 2 and 3 and discussed at paragraph 16. A transceiver allows both communication from and to a device. This teaching of networking cash acceptors together through networks so that they communicate with each other, combined with the teaching of Dobbins for cash acceptors to issue warnings of fraud attempts and alter acceptance criteria accordingly, would have led one of ordinary skill in the art to have combined Molbak's cash acceptors into networks in which they communicate fraud attempts with each other, with one or any of the cash acceptors communicating with and controlling other acceptors. Thus, it would have been obvious to exchange alarm signals between cash handling devices, based upon Dobbins' teaching, for the purpose of providing fraud alarms to each linked cash device, each said device then altering their acceptance criteria accordingly.

***Conclusion***

**4. THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

**5.** Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Jeffrey A. Shapiro whose telephone number is (571)272-6943. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday, 9:00 AM-5:00 PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Patrick H. Mackey can be reached on (571)272-6916. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Art Unit: 3653

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

JAS

August 14, 2007

  
PATRICK MACKEY  
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER  
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 3600